



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,018	03/02/2000	Hideaki Okamura	450100-02393	4073

20999 7590 01/15/2003

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG  
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/517,018

Applicant(s)

OKAMURA, HIDEAKI

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. Claims 1-2, 11-12, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al (US Patent 5,572,733) in view of Wold et al (US Patent 5,386,568).

As to claim 1, Ryu teaches data processing (data processing, col 4, ln 22-35), an object oriented operating system (the method, class, col 8, ln 44-51/ function, class, col 10, ln 25-45), a plurality objects (the exiting objects, col 9, ln 12-21/ the object parts, col 10, ln 38-45), an object (one new object, col 10, ln 10-20), a combining request message (a command link, col 10, ln 10-20), the predetermined object as a component object (the object, col 10, ln 10-20), a table data structure (the command link table, col 10, ln 10-20), a composite object( a composite object, col 9, ln 12-30/ composite object part, col 10, ln 38-65), registering ( a part register function is a function of registering the object parts in the parts attribute file 205, col 38-65), a message processing function ( the message to the method, col 10, ln 25-32, ln 51-57).

Ryu does not explicit teach the data structure for component object, message interface. However, Wold teaches a table, input data structure, input/ output (col 2, ln 40-68).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wold to Ryu in order to store or define location for necessary information to link between software objects.

As to claim 2, Ryu teaches a name of said component, a number of message interface (the names of the object parts, col 10, ln 57-64), a processing function (a schema function, col 10, ln 25-32/ function, col 10, ln 58-64).

As to claim 11, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 12, see the rejection of claim 2.

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 21, see the rejection of claim 1.

2. Claims 3-10, 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al (US Patent 5,572,733) in view of Wold et al (US Patent 5,386,568) and further in view Kavner (US Patent 6,430,607 B1)

As to claim 3, Ryu teaches a specific execution (execution process data 214, Fig 10/ col 10, ln 1-5/ col 12, ln 5-13), executes message processing (a transmitter/ receiver 219, fig 10/ col 12, ln 5-13).

Ryu does not teach a thread for execution processing. However, Kavner teaches thread of execution( col 4, ln 5-10).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Kavner to Ryu in order to perform only one object execute at a time. Objects programmer did not worry about concurrency.

As to claim 4, Ryu teaches a request (a command link, col 10, ln 10-20), a predetermined component object (new object/ the object, col 10, ln 10-20), composite object (composite object part, col 10, ln 38-64), register X (the combination of the meta data 202, real data 203, col 10, 10-20/ function of registering the object part, col 10, ln 58-64), table data structure (a command link table, col 10, ln 10-20).

Ryu does not explicit teach X as the data structure for component object. However, Wold teaches a table, input data structure (col 2, ln 40-68).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wold to Ryu in order to store or define location for necessary information to link between software objects.

As to claim 5, Ryu teaches checking (the object management unit 220/ col 12, ln 54-67 to col 13, ln 1-10/ the hyper process part 222, col 10, ln 25-45), the sequential execution relation

Art Unit: 2151

(the processing sequence, col 12, ln 54-67 to col 13, ln 1-10), component objects (the plurality of object parts (col 12, ln 54-67 to col 13, ln 1-10).

As to claim 6, Ryu teaches time (time movements, col 8, ln 1-3), the component object (sessions, col 8, ln 1-3), in parallel/ processing of another message (parallel processing, col 8, ln 1-3).

As to claim 7, see the rejection of claim 6.

As to claim 8, Ryu teaches a request (“ part combine” function, col 10, ln 25-45), composite object (composite object part, col 25-45), deleting registration (delete the schema related, col 10, ln 25-45).

As to claim 9, Ryu teaches message transimitted (message passing, col 3, ln 1-5), non-composite object (a primitive object, col 3, ln 11-65), component object (the objects, col 3, ln 1-18).

As to claim 10, Ryu does not explicit teach does not switching over an execution thread. However, Kavner teach a single thread ( col 4, ln 5-10).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Kavner to Ryu in order to prevent the switch over an execution thread because there is a single thread for executing multiple requests.

As to claim 13, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 4.

As to claim 15, see the rejection of claim 5.

As to claim 16, see the rejection of claim 6.

As to claim 17, see the rejection of claim 7.

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 18, see the rejection of claim 8.

As to claim 19, see the rejection of claim 9.

As to claim 20, see the rejection of claim 10.

3. Claims 22 –23-25 , 26-28, 29, 30, 21-32, 33-35, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al (US Patent 5,572,733) in view Kavner (US Patent 6,430,607 B1)

As to claim 22, Ryu teaches object (object, col 10, ln 10-20), message (message, col 3, ln 1-5), a composite object (composite object part, col 10, ln 10-45/ col 3, ln 12-65), one or more objects (the objects, col 3, ln 12-14/ one new object, col 10, ln 10-20), a standard object (the primitive object, col 3, ln 12-65), identifier (identification (ID), col 5, ln 65-67 to col 6, ln 1-19).

Ryu does not teach execution thread being shared by each component object. However, Kavner teaches multiple remote requests within the same thread of execution( col 4, ln 5-11).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Kavner to Ryu in order to perform only one object execute at a time. Objects programmer did not worry about concurrency.

As to claim 23, Ryu teaches message (a command link, col 10, ln 10-20), predetermined object (one new object, col 10, ln 10-20), another object (the object parts, col 10, ln 3-45), a name of object (the names, col 10, ln 10-65/ col 11, ln 60-65), an initializing method information (command link table, col 10, ln 10-20), initializing procedure (object command, col 10, ln 10-20), executing the method (the combination, col 10, ln 10-20).

As to claim 24, Ryu teaches information of object (read data, meta data, col 10, ln 10-20).

Art Unit: 2151

Ryu does not explicit teach the data structure for component object, message interface. However, Wold teaches a table, input data structure, input/ output ( col 2, ln 40-68).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Wold to Ryu in order to store or define location for necessary information to link between software objects.

As to claim 25, Ryu teaches deleted- object (deleting exiting object parts, col 12, ln 54-65), the name of the object must be deleted when the object is deleted from the composite object/ the specified descriptor is deleted (deleting the attribute related to the information, col 10, ln 25-45).

As to the rejection of claim 29, see the rejection of claim 22.

As to the rejection of claim 30, see the rejection of claim 23.

As to the rejection of claim 31, see the rejection of claim 24.

As to the rejection of claim 32, see the rejection of claim 25.

As to the rejection of claim 36, see the rejection of claim 22.

As to the rejection of claim 26, see the rejection of claim 6.

As to the rejection of claim 27, see the rejection of claim 10.

As to the rejection of claim 28, see the rejection of claim 15.

As to the rejection of claim 33, see the rejection of claim 26.

As to the rejection of claim 34, see the rejection of claim 27.

As to the rejection of claim 35, see the rejection of claim 28.

Art Unit: 2151

4.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

Fax phone: AFTER\_FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-2738, OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and send to: (703) 746-7239, NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 9000.

LeChi Truong  
January 13, 2003



ALVIN OBERLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100